

Endnotes

Chapter 2: Juvenile Dependency

Table 2.1

**Child Abuse Referrals by Allegation and Year
1999-2003**

Needell, B., Webster, D., Cuccaro-Alamin, S., Armijo, M., Lee, S., Lery, B., Shaw, T., Dawson, W., Piccus, W., Magruder, J., & Kim, H. (2004). Child Welfare Services Reports for California. Retrieved January 14, 2005, from University of California at Berkeley Center for Social Services Research Web site. URL: <http://cssr.berkeley.edu/CWSCMSreports/>

Counts of children with one or more referrals by year: children with multiple referrals are characterized by the most severe referral, defined by outcome (outcomes in descending order of severity are substantiated, inconclusive, unfounded, and assessment only) and by abuse type (abuse types in descending order of severity are sexual abuse, physical abuse, severe neglect, general neglect, exploitation, emotional abuse, caretaker absence/incapacity, and at risk but not abused).

A row is also included that counts children in referrals without allegations (missing/other), so that the total in each table counts all children listed in referrals. Beginning with 2003 Quarter 3 reports, counts of children with referrals are restricted to those with allegations.

Table 2.2

**Child Abuse Referrals by Race/Ethnicity and Year
1999-2003**

Needell, B., Webster, D., Cuccaro-Alamin, S., Armijo, M., Lee, S., Lery, B., Shaw, T., Dawson, W., Piccus, W., Magruder, J., & Kim, H. (2004). Child Welfare Services Reports for California. Retrieved January 14, 2005, from University of California at Berkeley Center for Social Services Research Web site. URL: <http://cssr.berkeley.edu/CWSCMSreports/>

Counts of children with one or more referrals by year: children with multiple referrals are characterized by the most severe referral, defined by outcome (outcomes in descending order of severity are substantiated, inconclusive, unfounded, and assessment only) and by abuse type (abuse types in descending order of severity are sexual abuse, physical abuse, severe neglect, general neglect, exploitation, emotional abuse, caretaker absence/incapacity, and at risk but not abused).

A row is also included that counts children in referrals without allegations (missing/other), so that the total in each table counts all children listed in referrals. Beginning with 2003 Quarter 3 reports, counts of children with referrals are restricted to those with allegations.

Race/ethnicity categories are Black, White (including White, White-Armenian, White-Central American, White-European, White-Middle Eastern, and White-Romanian), Hispanic (Hispanic, Mexican, South American, Caribbean, or those coded as being of Hispanic origin), Asian (Asian Indian, Cambodian, Chinese, Ethiopian, Filipino, Guamanian, Hawaiian, Japanese, Korean, Laotian, Other Asian/Pacific Islander, Hmong, Polynesian, Samoan, and Vietnamese), and Native American (Alaskan Native and American Indian).

Table 2.3

**Child Abuse Referrals by Age and Year
1999-2003**

Needell, B., Webster, D., Cuccaro-Alamin, S., Armijo, M., Lee, S., Lery, B., Shaw, T., Dawson, W., Piccus, W., Magruder, J., & Kim, H. (2004). Child Welfare Services Reports for California. Retrieved January 14, 2005, from University of California at Berkeley Center for Social Services Research Web site. URL: <http://cssr.berkeley.edu/CWSCMSreports/>

Counts of children with one or more referrals by year: children with multiple referrals are characterized by the most severe referral, defined by outcome (outcomes in descending order of severity are substantiated, inconclusive, unfounded, and assessment only) and by abuse type (abuse types in descending order of severity are sexual abuse, physical abuse, severe neglect, general neglect, exploitation, emotional abuse, caretaker absence/incapacity, and at risk but not abused).

A row is also included that counts children in referrals without allegations (missing/other), so that the total in each table counts all children listed in referrals. Beginning with 2003 Quarter 3 reports, counts of children with referrals are restricted to those with allegations.

Table 2.4
Child Abuse Referrals by Sex and Year
1999-2003

Needell, B., Webster, D., Cuccaro-Alamin, S., Armijo, M., Lee, S., Lery, B., Shaw, T., Dawson, W., Piccus, W., Magruder, J., & Kim, H. (2004). Child Welfare Services Reports for California. Retrieved January 14, 2005, from University of California at Berkeley Center for Social Services Research Web site. URL: <http://cssr.berkeley.edu/CWSCMSreports/>

Counts of children with one or more referrals by year: children with multiple referrals are characterized by the most severe referral, defined by outcome (outcomes in descending order of severity are substantiated, inconclusive, unfounded, and assessment only) and by abuse type (abuse types in descending order of severity are sexual abuse, physical abuse, severe neglect, general neglect, exploitation, emotional abuse, caretaker absence/incapacity, and at risk but not abused).

A row is also included that counts children in referrals without allegations (missing/other), so that the total in each table counts all children listed in referrals. Beginning with 2003 Quarter 3 reports, counts of children with referrals are restricted to those with allegations.

Table 2.5
Foster Care Maltreatment Referrals, Substantiations, and Percent Substantiated by Race/Ethnicity and Age
2003

Needell, B., Webster, D., Cuccaro-Alamin, S., Armijo, M., Lee, S., Lery, B., Shaw, T., Dawson, W., Piccus, W., Magruder, J., & Kim, H. (2004). Child Welfare Services Reports for California. Retrieved January 14, 2005, from University of California at Berkeley Center for Social Services Research Web site. URL: <http://cssr.berkeley.edu/CWSCMSreports/>

Because of missing age values, referrals and substantiations will not sum to ethnic group or overall totals.

Percent of referrals substantiated was recalculated by CFCC staff.

Counts of children with one or more referrals by year: children with multiple referrals are characterized by the most severe referral, defined by outcome (outcomes in descending order of severity are substantiated, inconclusive, unfounded, and assessment only) and by abuse type (abuse types in descending order of severity are sexual abuse, physical abuse, severe neglect, general neglect, exploitation, emotional abuse, caretaker absence/incapacity, and at risk but not abused).

Race/ethnicity categories are Black, White (including White, White-Armenian, White-Central American, White-European, White-Middle Eastern, and White-Romanian), Hispanic (Hispanic, Mexican, South American, Caribbean, or those coded as being of Hispanic origin), Asian (Asian Indian, Cambodian, Chinese, Ethiopian, Filipino, Guamanian, Hawaiian, Japanese, Korean, Laotian, Other Asian/Pacific Islander, Hmong, Polynesian, Samoan, and Vietnamese), and Native American (Alaskan Native and American Indian).

Table 2.6
Foster Care Maltreatment Referrals, Substantiations, and Percent Substantiated by County
2001-2002

Needell, B., Webster, D., Cuccaro-Alamin, S., Armijo, M., Lee, S., Lery, B., Shaw, T., Dawson, W., Piccus, W., Magruder, J., & Kim, H. (2004). Child Welfare Services Reports for California. Retrieved January 14, 2005, from University of California at Berkeley Center for Social Services Research Web site. URL: <http://cssr.berkeley.edu/CWSCMSreports/>

Because of missing age values, referrals and substantiations subtotals will not sum to total.

Counts of children with one or more referrals by year: children with multiple referrals are characterized by the most severe referral, defined by outcome (outcomes in descending order of severity are substantiated, inconclusive, unfounded, and assessment only) and by abuse type (abuse types in descending order of severity are sexual abuse, physical abuse, severe neglect, general neglect, exploitation, emotional abuse, caretaker absence/incapacity, and at risk but not abused).

County-specific tables count each child once per year in that county, so that a child with referrals in more than one county will appear in the tables for each county where a referral took place. Therefore, the sum of the children in each county table will add up to more than the total in the statewide tables.

Percent of referrals substantiated was recalculated by CFCC staff.

Table 2.7
Juvenile Dependency Filings and Dispositions
1994-2003

Judicial Council of California, Administrative Office of the Courts, Judicial Branch Statistical Information System (JBSIS). Retrieved January 6, 2005, from the JBSIS Web site, URL: <http://jbsis.courts.ca.gov/> (restricted access site).

Trinity County did not report for the years 1999 and 2001-2003. Modoc County did not report for the years 2002 and 2003. Humboldt County did not report for year 2003. Fresno County did not report dispositions for the years 2001-2003.

Dispositions per 100 filings calculated by CFCC staff.

Table 2.8
Juvenile Dependency Filings, Dispositions, and Stage at Disposition by County Court
2003

Judicial Council of California, Administrative Office of the Courts, Judicial Branch Statistical Information System (JBSIS). Retrieved January 6, 2005, from the JBSIS Web site, URL: <http://jbsis.courts.ca.gov/> (restricted access site).

Stage at disposition refers to the whether the petition is disposed before the start of a jurisdictional hearing in which first evidence is presented to the court for a determination of whether there is sufficient evidence to sustain the allegations in the petition. First evidence is when one or more parties or counsel appear and oral arguments, presentations relevant to the proceedings, witness testimony, and/or documents or tangible objects are submitted to the court.

Trinity Humboldt, and Modoc Counties did not report for the year 2003. Humboldt County did not report dispositions.

Table 2.9
Original Dependency Filings by County Court
1994-2003

Judicial Council of California, Administrative Office of the Courts, Judicial Branch Statistical Information System (JBSIS). Retrieved January 6, 2005, from the JBSIS Web site, URL: <http://jbsis.courts.ca.gov/> (restricted access site).

Trinity County did not report for the years 1999 and 2001-2003. Modoc County did not report for the years 2002 and 2003. Humboldt County did not report for year 2003. Fresno County did not report dispositions for the years 2001-2003.

Table 2.10
Original Dependency Dispositions by County Court
1994-2003

Judicial Council of California, Administrative Office of the Courts, Judicial Branch Statistical Information System (JBSIS). Retrieved January 6, 2005, from the JBSIS Web site, URL: <http://jbsis.courts.ca.gov/> (restricted access site).

Trinity County did not report for the years 1999 and 2001-2003. Modoc County did not report for the years 2002 and 2003. Humboldt County did not report for year 2003. Fresno County did not report dispositions for the years 2001-2003.

Table 2.11
Subsequent Dependency Filings by County Court
1994-2003

Judicial Council of California, Administrative Office of the Courts, Judicial Branch Statistical Information System (JBSIS). Retrieved January 6, 2005, from the JBSIS Web site, URL: <http://jbsis.courts.ca.gov/> (restricted access site).

Trinity County did not report for the years 1999, and 2001-2003. Modoc County did not report for the years 2002 and 2003. Humboldt County did not report for year 2003. Fresno County did not report dispositions for the years 2001-2003.

Table 2.12
Subsequent Dependency Dispositions by County Court
1994-2003

Judicial Council of California, Administrative Office of the Courts, Judicial Branch Statistical Information System (JBSIS). Retrieved January 6, 2005, from the JBSIS Web site, URL: <http://jbsis.courts.ca.gov/> (restricted access site).

Trinity County did not report for the years 1999 and 2001-2003. Modoc County did not report for the years 2002 and 2003. Humboldt County did not report for the year 2003. Fresno County did not report dispositions for the years 2001-2003.

Table 2.13
First Entries, Reentries, Exits From Care, and Net Change in Child Welfare Supervised Foster Care Population 1998-2003

Needell, B., Webster, D., Cuccaro-Alamin, S., Armijo, M., Lee, S., Lery, B., Shaw, T., Dawson, W., Piccus, W., Magruder, J., & Kim, H. (2004). Child Welfare Services Reports for California. Retrieved November 10, 2004, from University of California at Berkeley Center for Social Services Research Web site. URL: <http://cssr.berkeley.edu/CWSCMSreports/>

A child can have only one “first entry” to care, but can exit and reenter care numerous times in a given year. “Net change” therefore estimates the overall increase or decrease in the child welfare supervised foster care population for each calendar year.

Net Change recalculated by CFCC staff.

Table 2.14
First Entries to Foster Care by Removal Reason and Entry Year Children in Care Five Days or More, 1993-2003

Needell, B., Webster, D., Cuccaro-Alamin, S., Armijo, M., Lee, S., Lery, B., Shaw, T., Dawson, W., Piccus, W., Magruder, J., & Kim, H. (2004). Child Welfare Services Reports for California. Retrieved November 10, 2004, from University of California at Berkeley Center for Social Services Research Web site. URL: <http://cssr.berkeley.edu/CWSCMSreports/>

Neglect includes CWS/CMS categories Severe Neglect, General Neglect, and Caretaker Absence/Incapacity.

Other includes CWS/CMS categories Child’s Disability or Handicap, Disrupted Adoptive Placement, Emotional Abuse, Exploitation, Law Violation, Relinquishment, Status Offense, and Voluntary Placement.

Table 2.15
First Entries to Foster Care by First Placement Type and Entry Year Children in Care Five Days or More, 1993-2003

Needell, B., Webster, D., Cuccaro-Alamin, S., Armijo, M., Lee, S., Lery, B., Shaw, T., Dawson, W., Piccus, W., Magruder, J., & Kim, H. (2004). Child Welfare Services Reports for California. Retrieved November 10, 2004, from University of California at Berkeley Center for Social Services Research Web site. URL: <http://cssr.berkeley.edu/CWSCMSreports/>

Table 2.16
Median First-Spell Length of Stay in Days by Major Placement Type Children in Care Five Days or More, 1999-2001 Entries Combined

Needell, B., Webster, D., Cuccaro-Alamin, S., Armijo, M., Lee, S., Lery, B., Shaw, T., Dawson, W., Piccus, W., Magruder, J., & Kim, H. (2004). Child Welfare Services Reports for California. Retrieved

November 10, 2004, from University of California at Berkeley Center for Social Services Research Web site. URL: <http://cssr.berkeley.edu/CWSCMSreports/>

Medians computed with the Kaplan-Meier method.

Mixed placement represents multiple placements where no one type predominated; otherwise, children are characterized by the placement type that accounts for 50 percent or more of their placement time.

Children with a predominant facility type of Guardian or Missing were excluded from these analyses.

This report counts all children as being in care until the episode is closed in CWS/CMS. Therefore, the length of stay may be exaggerated, depending on the quality of county data.

The length of stay for children in Los Angeles County with a major facility type of "Shelter" appears to be extremely inflated because of a large number of children incorrectly coded with this facility type. Los Angeles staff has been informed of this issue.

Table 2.17
Children in Child Welfare Supervised Foster Care by Placement Type
January 1, 2000-2004

Needell, B., Webster, D., Cuccaro-Alamin, S., Armijo, M., Lee, S., Lery, B., Shaw, T., Dawson, W., Piccus, W., Magruder, J., & Kim, H. (2004). Child Welfare Services Reports for California. Retrieved February 14, 2005, from University of California at Berkeley Center for Social Services Research Web site. URL: <http://cssr.berkeley.edu/CWSCMSreports/>

Children with an open out-of-home placement record on the study date are categorized according to the placement type corresponding with that point in time, including: Kinship, Foster Family (Non-Relative), Foster Family (Non-Relative; Agency), Court Specified Home, Group, Shelter, Guardian, or Transitional Housing.

Children with an open placement episode, but not an open out-of-home placement record, are coded as being in Non-Foster Care if they have an open placement in that table on the study date, and on a Trial Home Visit or as a Runaway if indicated by the placement change reason of the last placement.

Children who appear to have a signed adoption agreement are removed from all other categories and are coded as being in Preadoptive Foster Care.

Children with an open placement episode, no open out-of-home placement, and no reliable data regarding why, are coded as Other.

Because of small sample sizes, the number of children counted in the Trial Home Visit and Other placement types may be inflated.

Table 2.18
Children in Child Welfare Supervised Foster Care by Placement Type and Time
In Current Placement Episode, January 1, 2003

Needell, B., Webster, D., Cuccaro-Alamin, S., Armijo, M., Lee, S., Lery, B., Shaw, T., Dawson, W., Piccus, W., Magruder, J., & Kim, H. (2004). Child Welfare Services Reports for California. Retrieved February 14, 2005, from University of California at Berkeley Center for Social Services Research Web site. URL: <http://cssr.berkeley.edu/CWSCMSreports/>

Children with an open out-of-home placement record on the study date are categorized according to the placement type corresponding with that point in time, including: Kinship, Foster Family (Non-Relative), Foster Family (Non-Relative; Agency), Court Specified Home, Group, Shelter, Guardian, or Transitional Housing.

Children with an open placement episode, but not an open out-of-home placement record, are coded as being in Non-Foster Care if they have an open placement in that table on the study date, and on a Trial Home Visit or as a Runaway if indicated by the placement change reason of the last placement.

Children who appear to have a signed adoption agreement are removed from all other categories and are coded as being in Preadoptive Foster Care.

Children with an open placement episode, no open out-of-home placement, and no reliable data regarding why, are coded as Other.

Because of small sample sizes, the number of children counted in the Trial Home Visit and Other placement types may be inflated.

Table 2.19
Children in Child Welfare Supervised Foster Care by Placement Type and Time
In Current Placement Episode, January 1, 2004

Needell, B., Webster, D., Cuccaro-Alamin, S., Armijo, M., Lee, S., Lery, B., Shaw, T., Dawson, W., Piccus, W., Magruder, J., & Kim, H. (2004). Child Welfare Services Reports for California. Retrieved February 14, 2005, from University of California at Berkeley Center for Social Services Research Web site. URL: <http://cssr.berkeley.edu/CWSCMSreports/>

Children with an open out-of-home placement record on the study date are categorized according to the placement type corresponding with that point in time, including: Kinship, Foster Family (Non-Relative), Foster Family (Non-Relative; Agency), Court Specified Home, Group, Shelter, Guardian, or Transitional Housing.

Children with an open placement episode, but not an open out-of-home placement record, are coded as being in Non-Foster Care if they have an open placement in that table on the study date, and on a Trial Home Visit or as a Runaway if indicated by the placement change reason of the last placement.

Children who appear to have a signed adoption agreement are removed from all other categories and are coded as being in Preadoptive Foster Care.

Children with an open placement episode, no open out-of-home placement, and no reliable data regarding why, are coded as Other.

Because of small sample sizes, the number of children counted in the Trial Home Visit and Other placement types may be inflated.

Table 2.20
Children in Child Welfare Supervised Foster Care by Supervising County and In-County
Placement
January 1, 2001-2003

Needell, B., Webster, D., Cuccaro-Alamin, S., Armijo, M., Lee, S., Lery, B., Shaw, T., Dawson, W., Piccus, W., Magruder, J., & Kim, H. (2004). Child Welfare Services Reports for California. Retrieved February 14, 2005, from University of California at Berkeley Center for Social Services Research Web site. URL: <http://cssr.berkeley.edu/CWSCMSreports/>

These tables are based on data about children who were placed in Kinship, Foster, Foster Family Agencies (FFA's), or Group Homes on July 1 of, 2001, 2002, and 2003. Supervising County refers to the county responsible for the child's case. Placement County refers to the county where the placement facility is physically located.

Table 2.21
Caseload by Service Component Type and Year
January 1, 2000-2004

Needell, B., Webster, D., Cuccaro-Alamin, S., Armijo, M., Lee, S., Lery, B., Shaw, T., Dawson, W., Piccus, W., Magruder, J., & Kim, H. (2004). Child Welfare Services Reports for California. Retrieved February 14, 2005, from University of California at Berkeley Center for Social Services Research Web site. URL: <http://cssr.berkeley.edu/CWSCMSreports/>

Probation and Kin-GAP cases in Los Angeles County are excluded.

Kin-GAP, a program designed to serve children whose dependency cases are dismissed when a relative caretaker assumes legal guardianship, went into effect January 1, 2001.

Table 2.22
Exits at 3, 6, 12, 15, 18, and 24 Months by Placement Type
Children in Care Five Days or More, 2001 First Entries to Care

Needell, B., Webster, D., Cuccaro-Alamin, S., Armijo, M., Lee, S., Lery, B., Shaw, T., Dawson, W., Piccus, W., Magruder, J., & Kim, H. (2004). Child Welfare Services Reports for California. Retrieved November 10, 2004, from University of California at Berkeley Center for Social Services Research Web site. URL: <http://cssr.berkeley.edu/CWSCMSreports/>

Only one exit per year per youth was recorded; cases with multiple exits count the most recent exit.

Kin-GAP, a program designed to serve children whose dependency cases are dismissed when a relative caretaker assumes legal guardianship, went into effect January 1, 2001. Thus, an unknown proportion of exits reported prior to 2001 in the Kin section may be reported as exiting via Other Guardianship.

Guardian and Missing placement types have been excluded from analysis.

As the quality of data entry may have improved over time, caution should be used in comparing across entry cohorts.

All children are counted as being in care until the episode is closed in CWS/CMS. Therefore, the proportion of children still in care may be overreported, and exits underreported, depending on the quality of county data.

Table 2.23
Outcomes per Year for Children Exiting by Kin/Non-Kin and Placement Type
1998-2003

Needell, B., Webster, D., Cuccaro-Alamin, S., Armijo, M., Lee, S., Lery, B., Shaw, T., Dawson, W., Piccus, W., Magruder, J., & Kim, H. (2004). Child Welfare Services Reports for California. Retrieved November 10, 2004, from University of California at Berkeley Center for Social Services Research Web site. URL: <http://cssr.berkeley.edu/CWSCMSreports/>

Only one exit per year per youth was recorded; cases with multiple exits count the most recent exit.

Kin-GAP, a program designed to serve children whose dependency cases are dismissed when a relative caretaker assumes legal guardianship, went into effect January 1, 2001. Thus, an unknown proportion of exits reported prior to 2001 in the Kin section may be reported as exiting via Other Guardianship.

Children with placement types such as child ran away from placement, other non-CWS agency has jurisdiction, and incarcerated are coded as Other.

Unclear exit type refers to termination reason types coded in CWS/CMS as *Other. This code is not currently valid, and appears to have been used for episodes closed during conversion to the CWS/CMS system with an unclear reason for exit.

Table 2.24
Reunified and Reentry Cases by Timing of Reunification and Race/Ethnicity
First Entries That Reunified, 1998, 1999, 2000, and 2001 Entries

Needell, B., Webster, D., Cuccaro-Alamin, S., Armijo, M., Lee, S., Lery, B., Shaw, T., Dawson, W., Piccus, W., Magruder, J., & Kim, H. (2004). Child Welfare Services Reports for California. Retrieved November 10, 2004, from University of California at Berkeley Center for Social Services Research Web site. URL: <http://cssr.berkeley.edu/CWSCMSreports/>

Reentries were tracked for children who entered welfare-supervised foster care for the first time, were in care at least 5 days, and then were reunified within 12 or 24 months.

Race/ethnicity categories are Black, White (including White, White-Armenian, White-Central American, White-European, White-Middle Eastern, and White-Romanian), Hispanic (Hispanic, Mexican, South American, Caribbean, or those coded as being of Hispanic origin), Asian (Asian Indian, Cambodian, Chinese, Ethiopian, Filipino, Guamanian, Hawaiian, Japanese, Korean, Laotian, Other Asian/Pacific Islander, Hmong, Polynesian, Samoan, and Vietnamese), and Native American (Alaskan Native and American Indian).

Table 2.25
Reunified and Reentry Cases by Timing of Reunification and Age at Entry
First Entries That Reunified, 1998, 1999, 2000, and 2001 Entries

Needell, B., Webster, D., Cuccaro-Alamin, S., Armijo, M., Lee, S., Lery, B., Shaw, T., Dawson, W., Piccus, W., Magruder, J., & Kim, H. (2004). Child Welfare Services Reports for California. Retrieved November 10, 2004, from University of California at Berkeley Center for Social Services Research Web site. URL: <http://cssr.berkeley.edu/CWSCMSreports/>

Reentries were tracked for children who entered welfare-supervised foster care for the first time, were in care at least 5 days, and then were reunified within 12 or 24 months.

Table 2.26
Reunified and Reentry Cases by Timing of Reunification and Sex
First Entries That Reunified, 1998, 1999, 2000, and 2001 Entries

Needell, B., Webster, D., Cuccaro-Alamin, S., Armijo, M., Lee, S., Lery, B., Shaw, T., Dawson, W., Piccus, W., Magruder, J., & Kim, H. (2004). Child Welfare Services Reports for California. Retrieved November 10, 2004, from University of California at Berkeley Center for Social Services Research Web site. URL: <http://cssr.berkeley.edu/CWSCMSreports/>

Reentries were tracked for children who entered welfare-supervised foster care for the first time, were in care at least 5 days, and then were reunified within 12 or 24 months.

Table 2.27
Recurrence of Abuse/Neglect Over Time by Race/Ethnicity
First Substantiated Reports, 2001 Base Period

Needell, B., Webster, D., Cuccaro-Alamin, S., Armijo, M., Lee, S., Lery, B., Shaw, T., Dawson, W., Piccus, W., Magruder, J., & Kim, H. (2004). Child Welfare Services Reports for California. Retrieved November 10, 2004, from University of California at Berkeley Center for Social Services Research Web site. URL: <http://cssr.berkeley.edu/CWSCMSreports/>

Allegation types of At Risk, Sibling Abused, or Substantial Risk are not included.

Only one substantiated referral per child is used. The selection process used in determining which substantiated referral to use produces a referral base count that is not necessarily equal to the referral counts. This happens because this report examines a referral series by collapsing primary and secondary referrals, while the referral counts look at all referrals as separate observations.

County-specific tables count each child once per year in that county, so that a child with referrals in more than one county will appear in the tables for each county where a referral took place. Therefore, the sum of the children in each county table will add up to more than the total in the statewide tables.

Race/ethnicity categories are Black, White (including White, White-Armenian, White-Central American, White-European, White-Middle Eastern, and White-Romanian), Hispanic (Hispanic, Mexican, South American, Caribbean, or those coded as being of Hispanic origin), Asian (Asian Indian, Cambodian, Chinese, Ethiopian, Filipino, Guamanian, Hawaiian, Japanese, Korean, Laotian, Other Asian/Pacific Islander, Hmong, Polynesian, Samoan, and Vietnamese), and Native American (Alaskan Native and American Indian).

Table 2.28
Recurrence of Abuse/Neglect Over Time by Age
First Substantiated Reports, 2001 Base Period

Needell, B., Webster, D., Cuccaro-Alamin, S., Armijo, M., Lee, S., Lery, B., Shaw, T., Dawson, W., Piccus, W., Magruder, J., & Kim, H. (2004). Child Welfare Services Reports for California. Retrieved November 10, 2004, from University of California at Berkeley Center for Social Services Research Web site. URL: <http://cssr.berkeley.edu/CWSCMSreports/>

Allegation types of At Risk, Sibling Abused, or Substantial Risk are not included.

Only one substantiated referral per child is used. The selection process used in determining which substantiated referral to use produces a referral base count that is not necessarily equal to the referral counts. This happens because this report examines a referral series by collapsing primary and secondary referrals, while the referral counts look at all referrals as separate observations.

County-specific tables count each child once per year in that county, so that a child with referrals in more than one county will appear in the tables for each county where a referral took place. Therefore, the sum of the children in each county table will add up to more than the total in the statewide tables.

Table 2.29
Recurrence of Abuse/Neglect Over Time by Sex
First Substantiated Reports, 2001 Base Period

Needell, B., Webster, D., Cuccaro-Alamin, S., Armijo, M., Lee, S., Lery, B., Shaw, T., Dawson, W., Piccus, W., Magruder, J., & Kim, H. (2004). Child Welfare Services Reports for California. Retrieved November 10, 2004, from University of California at Berkeley Center for Social Services Research Web site. URL: <http://cssr.berkeley.edu/CWSCMSreports/>

Allegation types of At Risk, Sibling Abused, or Substantial Risk are not included.

Only one substantiated referral per child is used. The selection process used in determining which substantiated referral to use produces a referral base count that is not necessarily equal to the referral counts. This happens because this report examines a referral series by collapsing primary and secondary referrals, while the referral counts look at all referrals as separate observations.

County-specific tables count each child once per year in that county, so that a child with referrals in more than one county will appear in the tables for each county where a referral took place. Therefore, the sum of the children in each county table will add up to more than the total in the statewide tables.

Table 2.30
Annual Recipients of Foster Care by County and Race/Ethnicity
July 2003

California Department of Social Services, Research and Development Division. *Annual Recipient Reports on CalWORKs, Foster Care (FC), Social Services, Nonassistance Food Stamps (NAFS), Welfare to Work (WTW), Refugee Cash Assistance (RCA), and the Cash Assistance Program for Immigrants (CAPI) Ethnic Origin and Primary Language*. Retrieved from the Department of Social Services Web site on January 7, 2005, from the July 2003 ABCD 350-Annual Recipient Report. URL: <http://www.dss.cahwnet.gov/research/res/pdf/abcd350/2002/ABCD350Jul03.xls>

Los Angeles County has 42 unspecified cases that were included in the total for that county and the overall total.

The Asian/Pacific Islander column includes those of Filipino, Chinese, Cambodian, Samoan, Asian Indian, Laotian, Vietnamese, Japanese, Korean, Hawaiian, Guamanian, and other Asian or Pacific Islander ethnic origins.

Totals computed by CFCC staff.

Table 2.31
Annual Recipients of Foster Care by County and Asian/Pacific Islander Ethnicity
July 2003

California Department of Social Services, Research and Development Division. *Annual Recipient Reports on CalWORKs, Foster Care (FC), Social Services, Nonassistance Food Stamps (NAFS), Welfare to Work (WTW), Refugee Cash Assistance (RCA), and the Cash Assistance Program for Immigrants (CAPI) Ethnic Origin and Primary Language*. Retrieved from the Department of Social Services Web site on January 7, 2005, from the July 2003 ABCD 350-Annual Recipient Report. URL: <http://www.dss.cahwnet.gov/research/res/pdf/abcd350/2002/ABCD350Jul03.xls>

The Other Asian or Pacific Islander column includes those of Japanese (37 recipients), Korean (75 recipients), Hawaiian (40 recipients), Guamanian (29 recipients), and the original Other Asian or Pacific Islander category supplied by the California Department of Social Services (352 recipients not delineated by ethnicity).

Totals computed by CFCC staff.

Table 2.32
Annual Recipients of Foster Care by County and Primary Language Spoken
July 2003

California Department of Social Services, Research and Development Division. *Annual Recipient Reports on CalWORKs, Foster Care (FC), Social Services, Nonassistance Food Stamps (NAFS), Welfare to Work (WTW), Refugee Cash Assistance (RCA), and the Cash Assistance Program for Immigrants (CAPI) Ethnic Origin and Primary Language*. Retrieved from the Department of Social Services Web site on January 7, 2005, from the July 2003 ABCD 350-Annual Recipient Report. URL: <http://www.dss.cahwnet.gov/research/res/pdf/abcd350/2002/ABCD350Jul03.xls>

According to the California Department of Social Services, the data in the Other Non-English Languages column varies by county, with many simply unknown. Languages listed and numbers are not delineated by type of social services recipient:

Alameda: Hindi, Punjabi, Amharic, Dinka, Somali, Tamil, Romanian, and Hawaiian.
 Contra Costa: Hindi, Punjabi, Somali, and Amharic.
 Fresno: Middle Eastern Indian.
 Glenn, Sutter, and Yuba Counties: Punjabi.
 Kern: Lyjarati and Hindu.
 Kings: Punjabi and Afghan Persian (Dari).
 Los Angeles: Amharic, Czech, Gujarati, Hindi, Hungarian, Indonesian, not specified, Punjabi, Rumanian, Serbian, Tigrinya, Yiddish, Yugoslavian, Dutch, German, Greek, Lingala, Lituianian, Malayo-Polynesian, Navajo, Romany (Gypsy), and Ukrainian. In Foster Care there are 76 "Other Not Specified."
 Marin, Monterey, Sacramento, San Bernardino, San Diego, San Francisco, Sonoma, Tulare, and Yolo Counties: Unknown
 Mendocino: Finnish and Hindu.
 Merced: Hindi.
 Napa: Hindi, Bengali, Punjabi, Urdu, and Hindu.
 Orange: Romanian and Farsi.
 Placer: Romanian.
 Riverside: Bosnian, Croatian, Egyptian, German, Hawaiian, Hindi, Lebanese, Palaun, Pashto, Persian, Punjabi, Romanian, Tausog, Urdu, Visayan, Yugoslavian, and Unknown.
 San Mateo: 5 Amharic, 3 Burmese, 1 Dinka, 54 Hindi, 36 Punjabi, 3 Sudanese, 2 Somali, and 3 Urdu.
 Santa Barbara: Mixteco.
 Santa Clara: Romanian and Hawaiian.
 Stanislaus: 259 Assyrian, 8 Afghanistan, 8 Persian, 15 Hindi, 1 Romanian, 19 Punjabi, 2 Fiji, 1 Tonga, 2 Ukranian, and 1 Urdu.
 Ventura: Albanian, Croation, Baao Filipino, Indonesian, 28 Not Identifiable, and Yugoslavian.

The Other Non-English Languages column also includes those of Armenian (13 recipients), Turkish (6 recipients), Hebrew (2 recipients), French (0 recipients), Polish (0 recipients), Russian (24 recipients), Portuguese (2 recipients), Italian (0 recipients), Arabic (7 recipients), Farsi (54 recipients), and the original Other Non-English Languages category supplied by the California Department of Social Services (62 recipients not delineated by language).

For those language categories that were known, the decision to subgroup the language categories provided by the California Department of Social Services was made by CFCC staff and is based on the categorization into Indo-European, Asian and Pacific Islander, and other language groups in the U.S. Census categories of languages, which can be found on the American FactFinder Web site, URL: http://factfinder.census.gov/servlet/QTTable?ds_name=D&geo_id=D&q_r_name=DEC_2000_SF3_U_QTP16&lang=en.

Totals computed by CFCC staff.

The Total Asian/Pacific Islander Languages column includes Cantonese, Korean, Tagalog, Mandarin, Cambodian, Hmong, Lao, Vietnamese, Japanese, Ilocana, Mein, other Chinese languages, Samoan, and Thai.

Table 2.33
Annual Recipients of Foster Care by County and Primary Asian/Pacific Islander Language Spoken July 2003

California Department of Social Services, Research and Development Division. *Annual Recipient Reports on CalWORKs, Foster Care (FC), Social Services, Nonassistance Food Stamps (NAFS), Welfare to Work (WTW), Refugee Cash Assistance (RCA), and the Cash Assistance Program for Immigrants (CAPI) Ethnic Origin and Primary Language*. Retrieved from the Department of Social Services Web site on January 7, 2005, from the July 2003 ABCD 350-Annual Recipient Report. URL: <http://www.dss.cahwnet.gov/research/res/pdf/abcd350/2002/ABCD350Jul03.xls>

For those language categories that were known, the decision to subgroup the language categories provided by the California Department of Social Services was made by CFCC staff and is based on the categorization into the Asian and Pacific Islander language group in the U.S. Census categories of languages, which can be found on the American FactFinder Web site, URL: http://factfinder.census.gov/servlet/QTTable?ds_name=D&geo_id=D&qr_name=DEC_2000_SF3_U_QTP16&lang=en.

Other Asian Languages include Japanese (5 recipients), Ilocana (1 recipient), Mein (15 recipients), other Chinese languages (2 recipients), Samoan (6 recipients), and Thai (1 recipient).

Totals computed by CFCC staff.

Table 2.34
Foster Care Independent Living Program Characteristics and Outcomes by Year October 1-September 30, 2000-2003

California Department of Social Services, Research and Development Division. *SOC 405 A-Independent Living Program (ILP) Annual Statistical Report(s) 2003, 2002, 2001, and 2000*. Retrieved from the Department of Social Services Web site on October 29, 2004. URL: http://www.dss.cahwnet.gov/research/SOC405A-In_415.htm

- 2000: Orange County collected data for the following ILP categories only:
Youths offered services during the year, and, for those received services, youths in the probation department or the county welfare department who received transitional housing placement services, and those for whom no information could be obtained.
- 2001: Orange County was unable to provide data for the following ILP categories of those who received services:
Youths who are single, married, or parents (sum of fathers and mothers), with special needs (educational, mental, or physical), no longer in foster care, who received ILP services during the six-month period following exit from foster care, continuing to receive ILP services, who completed high school/GED or adult education, continuing or currently enrolled in high school/GED or adult education, have completed vocational or on-the-job training, continuing or currently enrolled in vocational education or on-the-job training, enrolled in college, in a community college, or in a four-year university, who obtained employment, who obtained full-time employment, who obtained part-time employment, enlisted in military, Job Corps, or California Conservation Corps, actively seeking employment, determined unemployable, SSI eligible, or other similar special category, who are living independently of agency maintenance programs,

who obtained subsidized housing, who transitioned into other government assisted services, who were appropriate for and were denied transitional housing placement services, or those who were appropriate for and were denied transitional housing placement services.

- 2002 and 2003: Calaveras County was unable to provide data for the following ILP categories of those who received services:
Youths who received ILP services and have special needs (educational, mental, or physical), are continuing or currently enrolled in high school/GED or adult education, who have completed vocational or on-the-job training, are continuing or currently enrolled in vocational education or on-the-job training, in a four-year university, who obtained employment, who obtained full-time employment, who obtained part-time employment, are actively seeking employment, determined unemployable, SSI eligible, or other similar special category, who are living independently of agency maintenance programs, who obtained subsidized housing, or those for whom no safe and affordable housing was available or for whom no information was obtained.
- 2002: Fresno County was unable to provide data for the following ILP categories of those who received services: Youths who were appropriate for and were denied transitional housing placement services.
- 2002: Madera County was unable to provide data for youths who transitioned into other government-assisted services and does not provide data for either youths who received transitional housing placement services or those who were appropriate for and were denied transitional housing placement services because those services are not offered by the county.
- 2003: Contra Costa County was unable to provide data for the following ILP categories of those who received services:
Youths who received ILP services and were living independently, or those for whom no safe and affordable housing was available or for whom no information was obtained.
- 2003: Fresno County was unable to provide data for the following ILP categories of those who received services:
Youths who received ILP services and have special needs (educational, mental, or physical), who were living independently, who received other government services, or those for whom no safe and affordable housing was available or for whom no information was obtained.
- 2003: Merced County was unable to provide data for youths who received ILP services and have special needs (educational, mental, or physical), and does not provide data for either youths who received transitional housing placement services or those who were appropriate for and were denied transitional housing placement services because those services are not offered by the county.
- 2003: Monterey County was unable to provide data for the following ILP categories of those who received services:
Youths who received ILP services and are actively seeking employment, determined unemployable, SSI eligible, or other similar special category, who are living independently of agency maintenance programs, who received other government services, or those for whom no safe and affordable housing was available.
- 2003: San Luis Obispo and Stanislaus Counties were unable to provide data for either youths who received transitional housing placement services or those who were appropriate for and were denied transitional housing placement services because those services are not offered by those counties.
- 2003: Yolo County was unable to provide data for the following ILP categories of those who received services: Youths for whom no safe and affordable housing was available.

Table 2.35
Foster Care Independent Living Program Youths Served by County
October 1, 2002-September 30, 2003

California Department of Social Services, Research and Development Division. *SOC 405 A-Independent Living Program (ILP) Annual Statistical Report(s) 2003, 2002, 2001, and 2000*. Retrieved from the Department of Social Services Web site on October 29, 2004. URL:
http://www.dss.cahwnet.gov/research/SOC405A-In_415.htm

Table 2.36
Foster Care Independent Living Program Client Characteristics by County
October 1, 2002-September 30, 2003

California Department of Social Services, Research and Development Division. *SOC 405 A-Independent Living Program (ILP) Annual Statistical Report(s) 2003, 2002, 2001, and 2000*. Retrieved from the Department of Social Services Web site on October 29, 2004. URL:
http://www.dss.cahwnet.gov/research/SOC405A-In_415.htm

Calaveras, Fresno, and Merced Counties were unable to provide data for youths who received ILP services from October 1, 2002, through September 30, 2003, and have special needs (educational, mental, or physical).

Table 2.37
Foster Care Independent Living Program Client Progress by County
October 1, 2002-September 30, 2003

California Department of Social Services, Research and Development Division. *SOC 405 A-Independent Living Program (ILP) Annual Statistical Report(s) 2003, 2002, 2001, and 2000*. Retrieved from the Department of Social Services Web site on October 29, 2004. URL:
http://www.dss.cahwnet.gov/research/SOC405A-In_415.htm

- 2003: Calaveras County was unable to provide data for the following ILP categories of those who received services:
Youths who are continuing or currently enrolled in high school/GED or adult education, who have completed vocational or on-the-job training, are continuing or currently enrolled in vocational education or on-the-job training, in a four-year university, who obtained employment, who obtained full-time employment, who obtained part-time employment, are actively seeking employment, determined unemployable, SSI eligible, or other similar special category, who are living independently of agency maintenance programs, who obtained subsidized housing, who transitioned into other government-assisted services, or those who were appropriate for and were denied transitional housing placement services.
- 2003: Contra Costa County was unable to provide data for the following ILP categories of those who received services:
Youths who received ILP services and were living independently, or those for whom no safe and affordable housing was available or for whom no information was obtained.
- 2003: Fresno County was unable to provide data for the following ILP categories of those who received services:
Youths who received ILP services and were living independently, who received other government services, or those for whom no safe and affordable housing was available or for whom no information was obtained.

- 2003: Merced County does not provide data for either youths who received transitional housing placement services or those who were appropriate for and were denied transitional housing placement services because those services are not offered by the county.
- 2003: Monterey County was unable to provide data for the following ILP categories of those who received services:
Youths who received ILP services and are actively seeking employment, determined unemployable, SSI eligible, or other similar special category, who are living independently of agency maintenance programs, who received other government services, or those for whom no safe and affordable housing was available.
- 2003: San Luis Obispo and Stanislaus Counties were unable to provide data for either youths who received transitional housing placement services or those who were appropriate for and were denied transitional housing placement services because those services are not offered by those counties.
- 2003: Yolo County was unable to provide data for the following ILP categories of those who received services: Youths for whom no safe and affordable housing was available.

Table 2.38
Juvenile Dependency Court Services by County
2003-2004

California CASA Association (Court Appointed Special Advocates). Retrieved November 15, 2004, from California CASA Association Web site, URL: <http://www.californiacasa.org/>; and California Administrative Office of the Courts, Center for Families, Children & the Courts, *Research Update: Court-Based Juvenile Dependency Mediation in California* (March 2003; unpublished update of number of programs by county, July 2003).

Karuk Tribe of California-Tribal Court CASA is located in Yreka, (Siskiyou County) and was added in 2004 to California's CASA programs.

Table 2.39
Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel by Practice Type and County
September 2003

California Administrative Office of the Courts; administrative data maintained by the Center for Families, Children & the Courts. Valid as of September 1, 2003.

These figures do not include court-appointed dependency counsel who work on appellate dependency cases and do not work on dependency cases in the trial courts.

Table 2.40
Attendance at Foster and Kinship Care Education Community College
Programs by Program Type, Fiscal Years 1998-1999 to 2000-2001

California Community Colleges' Chancellor's Office (CCCCO). *Foster and Kinship Care Education Program, 2001-2002: Annual Report*. Retrieved July 25, 2003, from the CCCCCO Web site, URL: http://www.cccco.edu/divisions/ss/fostercare/attachments/annual_rpt11_14_01.doc

Attendance figures are unduplicated participant counts.

Table 2.41
Foster and Kinship Care Education Programs in Community Colleges by County
January 2003

California Community Colleges' Chancellor's Office (CCCCO). *Foster and Kinship Care Education Program, 2001-2002: Annual Report*. Retrieved July 25, 2003, from the CCCCCO Web site, URL:
http://www.cccco.edu/divisions/ss/fostercare/attachments/annual_rpt11_14_01.doc

Table 2.42
Office of the Ombudsman for Foster Care-Cases, Case Types, and Resolution
May 1, 2001-2003

State of California, Office of the Ombudsman for Foster Care. *Annual Report, May 2001-May 2002 and Update Report and May 2002-2003*. Retrieved October 29, 2004, from the Web site, URL:
<http://www.fosteryouthhelp.ca.gov/>